

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 12, 16, 18, 20, and 23 have been amended. Claims 2, 13, 14, and 19 have been canceled. Claims 25-28 have been added. After entry of these amendments, claims 1, 3-12, 15-18, and 20-28 will be pending.

## REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(B)

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barnett et al. (6,369,840 B1).

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for displaying search results in response to a search query comprising:

obtaining a product search query generated by a user;

responsive to the query, obtaining search results comprising a set of links, each of the links associated with a web document determined to be relevant to the query; and

displaying the set of links in an **order corresponding to a relevance ranking** and according to a plurality of user-selectable formats, wherein the plurality of user-selectable formats includes a grid view and a list view.

Claim 1 describes a method for displaying search query results comprising obtaining a product search query and obtaining search results comprising a set of links, each associated with a web document determined to be relevant to the query. The links are displayed in an **order corresponding to a relevance ranking** and consistent with user-selectable formats, where the formats include a list and grid view. The other independent claims, 12, 16, 18, 20, and 23, recite limitations similar to some of these.

The cited reference, Barnett, makes no such mention of a relevance ranking. Instead, Barnett discusses generating and displaying a calendar of events associated with a plurality of categories. (Abstract). As the reference makes clear, the events are chronologically displayed, regardless of whether they appear in list or calendar form. (Barnett, Figs. 7A- 10) In Barnett, there is no indication that a relevance ranking is determined. Indeed, the words “rank” and “ranking” cannot be found anywhere in Barnett. Thus, Barnett fails to disclose “displaying the set of links in an **order corresponding to a relevance ranking** and according to a plurality of user-selectable formats, wherein the plurality of user-selectable formats includes a grid view and a list view.”

#### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 7, 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett. As discussed above, Barnett makes no mention of a relevance ranking. Applicants respectfully submit these claims incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, 16, 18, 20, and 23 are allowable over the cited reference at least for the reasons described above. Claims 3-11 and 25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, claims 15 and 26 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12, claims 17 and 27 depend directly or indirectly from claim 16, claim 28 depends from claim 18, claims 21 and 22 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20, and claim 24 depends from claim 23. In addition to containing all of the limitations from the claims from which they depend, respectively, these claims also contain additional limitations that are not shown by the cited reference.

In addition, newly added claims 25 through 28 discuss that the “relevance ranking comprises a numerical value corresponding to a calculated relevance of each document [or search result] determined to be relevant to the query [or product search].” Barnett does not discuss any such relevance ranking; instead, it displays events chronologically, regardless of whether they are displayed as a list or in calendar form.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are allowable over the cited reference for the reasons described above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
CRAIG NEVILL-MANNING, ET AL.

Date: September 6, 2007

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 48,449  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7198  
Fax: (650) 938-5200  
E-Mail: [bsimon@fenwick.com](mailto:bsimon@fenwick.com)